Case: 1:11-cv-08808 Document #: 23 Filed: 10/22/19 Page 1 of 4 PageID #:394

## **United States District Court Northern District of Illinois MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAR PRO HAC VICE**

Case Title:			Plantiff(s)			
	VS.					
		Defendant(s)				
Case Number:	Judge:					
Ι,		hereb	y apply to the Court			
under Local Rule 83.14 for permission to appear and participate in the above-entitled action on behalf of						
	by whom I have been retained.					
I am a member in good standing and eligible to practice before the following courts:						
Title of Court			Date Admitted			
I have currently, or within the year preceding the date of this application, made pro hac vice applications to this Court in the following actions:						
Case Number	Case Title	Date of Application (Granted or Denied)*				
*If denied, please explain: (Attach additional form if necessary)						
Pursuant to Local Rule 83.15(a), applicants who do not have an office within the Northern District of Illinois must designate, at the time of filing their initial notice or pleading, a member of the bar of this Court having an office within this District upon who service of papers may be made.						
	Has the applicant designated local counsel? Yes	No				

If you have not designated local counsel, Local Rule 83.15(b) provides that the designation must be made within thirty (30) days.

Case: 1: Has the applicant ever bee	11-cv-08808 Docume	ent #: 23 Filed: 1	.0/22/19 Page	2 of 4 PageII	) #:395		
	barred, or otherwise disci	plined by any court?	Yes	No			
or is the applicant curren applicant's professional	ntly the subject of an inves conduct?	tigation of the	Yes	No			
transferred to inactive status, voluntarily withdraw bar of any court?		vn, or resigned from	the Yes	No			
denied admission to the bar of any court?			Yes	No			
held in contempt of court?			Yes	No			
NOTE: If the answer to <i>any</i> of the above questions is yes, please attach a brief description of the incident(s) and the applicant's current status before any court, or any agency thereof, where disciplinary sanctions were imposed, or where an investigation or investigations of the applicant's conduct may have been instituted.  I have read the Rules of Professional Conduct for the Northern District of Illinois and the Standards for Professional Conduct within the Seventh Federal Judicial Circuit, and will faithfully adhere to them. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.							
		S/			_		
Date		Electron	ic Signature of App	olicant			
Applicant's Name	Last Name		First Name		Middle Name/Initial		
Applicant's Law Firm							
Applicant's Address	Street Address				Room/Suite Number		
	City	State	ZIP Code	Work Phone N	umber		

(The pro hac vice admission fee is \$150.00 and shall be paid to the Clerk. No admission under Rule 83.14 is effective until such time as the fee has been paid.)

**NOTE:** Attorneys seeking to appear pro hac vice may wish to consider filing a petition for admission to the general bar of this Court. The fee for admission to the General Bar is \$181.00 The fee for pro hac vice admission is \$150.00. Admission to the general bar permits an attorney to practice before this Court. Pro hac vice admission entitles an attorney to appear in a particular case only. Application for such admission must be made in each case; and the admission fee must be paid in each case.

## **ATTACHMENT A**

Kraft Foods Global, Inc.; The Kellogg Company; General Mills, Inc. and Nestlé USA, Inc.

## **Attachment B**

Court	<b>Date Admitted</b>	Bar
California State Bar Admission	December 7, 2000	<b>Number</b> 211379
	,	211379
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal	October 13, 2009	
Circuit		
U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit	June 25, 2012	
U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit	August 12, 2011	
U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit	December 14, 2000	
U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit	November 15, 2013	
U.S. District Court, Central District of California	December 3, 2000	
U.S. District Court, Northern District of California	February 8, 2002	
U.S. District Court, Southern District of California	December 3, 2001	
U.S. Supreme Court	March 24, 2014	